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Fracking Rubric

Using what you have already learned about the construction and composition of the earth and research that you will be doing for this paper on the process of fracking, a method of extracting petroleum resources from deep in the earth will be examined. This paper will cover extensive information. It will require comprehensive research and writing of approximately 5 pages or more. It is worth 100 project/test points. Topics that should be covered include the following:

1. What is fracking?
2. Discuss the history of fracking and why it has recently become a more prominent issue.
3. What are the benefits of fracking?
4. What are the negative short-term consequences of fracking?
5. What are the potential negative long-term consequences of fracking?
6. If it were up to you, how do you think fracking should be regulated or utilized?

The paper should be written in APA format using appropriate internal citations. **One source, at least, must be a scientific journal or primary source, but more of these sources are recommended.** If there is more than one sentence that draws information from the same source, then include the source at the end of all of the information. An exception to this would be unless a direct quote or citation of a specific statistic. In this case, include the citation at the end of that sentence also. The generic structure for a website source is:

Last, F. M. (Year, Month Date Published). Article title. Retrieved from URL

For example,

Many scientists and civilians debate the beneficial and harmful potential of fracking. “Hydraulic fracturing, better known as fracking, is the process of drilling into shale formations and injecting a cocktail of water, sand, and chemicals to create tiny fractures that access pockets of oil and natural gas” (Miller, 2015).

Full citation (with a number for the numerical list):

1. Miller, J. (2015, June 24). Why It’s So Hard To Regulate Fracking. *The American Prospect.* Retrieved from <http://prospect.org>

**Please remember other scientific paper recommendations, such as: no contractions, write in the third person, do not use slang, etc**. For this assignment, use the third person throughout the paper despite some of it being opinion.

There is a resource page which Ms. Arnold will be showing you as well as books on fracking available in the library.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Proficient (15 points)** | **Emerging (10 points)** | **Beginning (5 points)** |
| What is fracking | The description is scientifically accurate and provides enough of a basis for readers to comprehend the rest of the components of the paper | The description is present, but not extensive enough for readers to understand the rest of the paper. There may be occasional scientific inaccuracies or ambiguous statements. | The description is brief or absent. Clarity is lacking and inaccuracies are present. A reader of just this paper would be unable to describe what fracking is. |
| The history of fracking and why it has become an issue now. | The discussion of the history of fracking covers the beginning of fracking through the current situation in a succinct summary of only important details. The connection between why it is currently controversial and a more prominent issue is clear. Some discussion of the legislation of fracking is present. | The discussion of the history of fracking misses a key element. A discussion of why fracking has become a prominent issue is present, but may be limited. | The discussion of the history of fracking is superficial and uneven including the absence of key elements of the history of fracking. The connection between why fracking has become a prominent issue is unclear or absent. |
| The benefits of fracking | The benefits are clearly stated with supported details. The connections between fracking and the benefits are clear. | The benefits are stated, but detail and support are lacking. It may not be clear how fracking could be used beneficially or why it is beneficial. | The benefits are unclear, absent or unsupported. A reader of just this paper would be unable to describe the benefits of fracking. |
| The negative short-term consequences of fracking | The consequences are clearly stated with supported details. The connection between the negative short-term consequences and fracking is clear. A distinction between short-term and long-term consequences is clear. | The consequences are stated, but detail and support and lacking. The discussion of short-term and long-term consequences of fracking may be blurred. | The discussion of the short-term negative consequences of fracking is unclear, absent or unsupported. A reader of just this paper would be unable to describe the consequences of fracking. |
| The potential negative long-term consequences of fracking | The consequences are clearly stated with supported details. The connection between the negative long-term consequences and fracking is clear. A distinction between short-term and long-term consequences is clear. | The consequences are stated, but detail and support are lacking. The discussion of short-term and long-term consequences may be blurred. | The discussion of the long-term negative consequences of fracking is unclear, absent or unsupported. A reader of just this paper would be unable to describe the consequences of fracking. |
| If it were up to you, how do you think fracking should be regulated or utilized? | The opinion on fracking has an obvious, well-stated rationale that is supported with scientific and historical evidence. Not only is the chosen opinion supported, but the opposing opinion is refuted. | The opinion on the use of fracking is clearly stated, but the rationale is weak or vague. Supportive evidence is present, but not extensive enough. There may be little or unconvincing refutation of opposing opinions. | The opinion on fracking is weak or vague. There is little support or rationale provided for the opinion. Refutation of opposing opinions is absent or unclear. |
|  | **Proficient (5 points)** | **Emerging (3 points)** | **Beginning (1 points)** |
| Organization and Structure | Topics are presented and then supported in a logical way. The information is distinct so that it can be understood individually, but connections between topics are made. Grammatical and spelling rules were followed. Obvious care was put into the construction of the paper. | There is a pattern to how topics are presented, but the line between topics is sometimes blurred. There are a few grammatical and spelling errors. The paper needed more review and editing. | The organization of the paper was lacking. Connections from topic to topic and from topic to supportive statements unclear. Grammatical and spelling errors made the paper difficult to follow. Much more editing was needed. |
| Support and Bibliography | All important statements and opinions were supported and documented with properly composed internal citations. There were one or more scientific journal citations made. The bibliography was written in a numerical list, organized alphabetically and written in APA format. | Most important statements were supported and documented with properly composed internal citations. The bibliography was written in a numerical list, organized alphabetically and written in APA format. | Important statements were not cited or cited incorrectly. The bibliography did not follow APA format and/or was not written in an appropriately structured list. |